



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Mr.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,988	07/24/2002	Brian Evan McGinnis	06-545-B	5980
20306	7590	04/09/2007	EXAMINER	
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP 300 S. WACKER DRIVE 32ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			SCUDERI, PHILIP S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2153	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/019,988	MCGINNIS ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Philip S. Scuderi	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22,25-46 and 49-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22,25-46 and 49-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2-5 and 26-29 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 18 January 2007.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection below.

Claim Objections

Claim 2-5 and 26-29 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claims 2-5 further limit the palm-sized computer recited in the preamble of parent claim 1. However, the palm-sized computer is not required by parent claim 1 because it is a mere intended use of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2111.02(II). So, these claims do not further limit the scope of claim 1.

Claims 26-29 further limit the palm-sized computer recited in the preamble of parent claim 25. However, the palm-sized computer is not required by parent claim 25 because it is a mere intended use of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2111.02(II). So, these claims do not further limit the scope of claim 25.

Applicant is advised that should claim 15 be found allowable, claim 39 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are

duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Applicant is advised that should claim 16 be found allowable, claim 40 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 25-38, 45, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 25 recites the limitation "the indicated scope of network inventory information" in lines 18-19. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because the step of "indicating a scope of network inventory information" has been removed from the claim by amendment.

Claims 26-38, 45, and 46 depend from claim 25 and are rejected for the same reasons.

The examiner will treat these claims on the merits as best understood.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-22, 25-46, and 49-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloba (U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,316) in view of Bowler (Forms for the World Wide Web, by Vaughn Bowler, dated January 1996) and Prithviraj (U.S. Pat. No. 5,987,513).

As to claims 1, Kloba teaches a method comprising:

receiving a request to submit a page, wherein the page includes a data field being identified by an input type associated with the data field (column 15, line 54 to column 16, line 50);
transmitting the modified URL to a proxy server by using a compact transfer protocol (CTP), wherein the proxy server uses the modified URL to (i) generate a HTTP query and to (ii) send the HTTP query to a web server (column 15, lines 15-43; column 21, lines 31-52); and
receiving updated information from the proxy server, responsive to the transmitted URL (column 21, lines 31-52).

Kloba does not disclose, in response to receiving the request, modifying a uniform resource locator (URL), wherein the modified URL includes (i) a page name, (ii) a field index value for each of the data fields, and (iii) user data associated with each of the field index values.

Kloba discloses use of web forms (column 15, line 54 to column 16, line 50). The claimed modifying step is merely the conventional way of modifying a URL to post a web form using the

“GET” method (as opposed to the “POST” method). The GET method provides advantages such as enabling links to be bookmarked and therefore would have been obvious to use here.

Kloba does not disclose that the data fields (input tags of the web forms) are identified by (ii) an index value corresponding to a relative position of the data field on the page.

Kloba discloses that the forms can be, for example, radio buttons (column 16, line 7). It was well known in the art to provide radio buttons with index values corresponding to a relative position of the data fields on the corresponding page, as evidenced by Bowler.

In a similar art, Bowler shows standard code for implementing radio buttons wherein the data fields (input tags) have index values (value attributes equal to 1, 2, and 3) corresponding to a relative position of the data fields on the page (1st, 2nd, and 3rd button positions) (see the bottom of page 4). It would have been obvious to use similar code for implementing the radio buttons here because this was the standard way to implement radio buttons.

Kloba does not disclose that the page indicates a network management function or that the information received from the proxy server is network management information.

In a similar art, Prithviraj teaches a method for indicating network management functions using web pages wherein the user makes selections such as selecting classes of routers etc. (column 2, lines 46-60; column 13, lines 5-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Kloba’s device to access Prithviraj’s network management pages because doing so would allow a person to easily monitor a remote network etc. (Prithviraj, column 2, lines 38-44).

As to claim 25, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 and because Prithviraj teaches receiving network inventory information (column 13, lines 1-26).

As to claim 49, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 and because Kloba discloses use of a palm-sized computer running a browser (column 10, lines 36-42).

As to claims 2-5 and 26-29, these claims do not further limit claims 1 and 25 and are therefore rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 25.

As to claims 6, 30, and 53-55, Prithviraj teaches that the network management function and the network inventory information include changing a configuration of a device (column 13, lines 25-36; column 15, lines 40-46; column 16, lines 29-38).

As to claims 7, 31, and 56-58, Prithviraj teaches that the network management function and the network inventory information include changing an inventory description of a device (column 13, lines 25-36; column 15, lines 40-46; column 16, lines 29-38).

As to claims 8, 32, 59, and 60, Prithviraj teaches that the network management function and the network inventory information include accessing historical information about a device (column 13, lines 25-36; column 15, lines 40-46; column 16, lines 29-38).

As to claims 9 and 33, Prithviraj teaches that the network management function and the network inventory information include accessing web-based support information (column 13, lines 25-36; column 15, lines 40-46; column 16, lines 29-38).

As to claims 10 and 34, Prithviraj teaches that the network management function and the network inventory information include accessing intranet-based support information (column 13, lines 25-36; column 15, lines 40-46; column 16, lines 29-38).

As to claims 11 and 35, Prithviraj teaches that the network management function and the network inventory information include accessing server-based support information (column 13, lines 25-36; column 15, lines 40-46; column 16, lines 29-38).

As to claims 12, 36, and 61, Kloba teaches that transmitting the generated URL to a proxy server includes connecting to a synchronization server by placing the palm-sized computer in a

communications cradle and pressing a hot sync button (column 5, lines 41-52; column 8, lines 16-28).

As to claims 13 and 37, Kloba teaches that pressing the hot sync button starts the synchronization server (column 5, lines 41-52).

As to claims 14, 38, and 62, Kloba teaches that transmitting the generated URL to a proxy server includes connecting to a synchronization server by using a radio signal and a wireless communication server in communication with the synchronization server (figure 1; column 9, lines 48-62).

As to claims 15 and 39, Kloba teaches that a wireless communication server starts the server when needed (column 5, lines 41-52).

As to claims 16 and 40, Kloba teaches that connecting with the synchronization server includes using encryption (SSL) (column 5, lines 41-52).

As to claims 17, 41, and 63, Kloba teaches that any wireless protocol can be used to connect to the synchronization server (column 9, lines 48-62). Infrared communication would have been obvious to use here because it had well known advantages such as low cost and low interference with other signals.

As to claims 18 and 42, Kloba teaches that the transmitting and receiving includes encoding and decoding in a compact markup language (column 5, line 12 et seq.)

As to claims 19, 20, 43, and 44, Kloba discloses that the markup language is encoded for efficiency (column 5, line 12 et seq.), but does not expressly disclose use of five-bit encoding or variable length strings. Nonetheless, formats that used five-bit encoding and variable length strings were well known in the art and it would have been obvious to use them here for the same efficiency reasons.

As to claims 21, 22, 45, and 46, Prithviraj teaches that the page includes a form and data and the received network management and network inventory information includes an updated version of some or all of the data and does not include the form (column 13, lines 1-26; column 21, lines 22-26).

As to claim 50, Kloba teaches that the palm-sized computer is smaller than four inches by six inches (column 10, lines 36-42).

As to claims 51 and 52, Kloba does not expressly disclose that the palm-sized computer has a 160x160 pressure sensitive display. Nonetheless, palm-sized computers with such displays were well known in the art and would have been obvious to use here for the same reasons that Kloba uses any of the other palm-sized computers that are expressly disclosed.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip S. Scuderi whose telephone number is (571) 272-5865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PS



GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100